2002 ANNUAL REPORT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ADVISORY COMMISSION ON SENTENCING

November 27, 2002

ADVISORY COMMISSION ON SENTENCING

The Hon. Harold L. Cushenberry, Associate Judge, Superior
Court of the District of Columbia

The Hon. Frederick H. Weisberg, Associate Judge,
Superior Court of the District of Columbia and Chair of
the Commission

Laura Hankins, Esq., Chief Legislative Counsel, Public Charles F. Wellford, Ph.D., University of Maryland,

Defender Service appointed by the Chief Judge of the Superior Court

Cedric Hendricks, Special Assistant to the Director, Court
Services and Offender Supervision Agency

Citizen Member [Vacant], appointed by the Council of the District of Columbia

The Hon. J. Ramsey Johnson, Associate Judge, Superior Court Corporation Counsel [Vacant] of the District of Columbia

The Hon. Kathy Patterson, Chair, Committee on the Judiciary, Non-voting members: Council of the District of Columbia

Patricia Riley, Esq., Special Counsel to the United States

Brenda Baldwin-White, Esq., Deputy General Counsel,

DC Department of Corrections

Michele Roberts, Esq., an attorney in private practice, appointed by the Chief Judge of the Superior Court Peter Hoffman, Ph.D., representing the U.S. Parole Commission

Earl J. Silbert, Esq., an attorney in private practice, appointed by the Chief Judge of the Superior Court Nola M. Joyce, Senior Executive Director, Metropolitan Police Department

Julie Stewart, President, Families against Mandatory

Minimums, appointed by the Mayor of the District of Columbia

Thomas R. Kane, Ph.D., Assistant Director for Information, Policy and Public Affairs, Federal Bureau of Prisons

Staff: Kim S. Hunt, Ph.D. Executive Director

Chan Chanhatasilpa, Ph.D. Research Analyst

> Jim Cronin Research Analyst

> Rachel Buske Research Analyst

Kelley Thomas Administrative Assistant

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In addition to the efforts of Commission members and Commission staff, several people made significant contributions to the Commission's activities and to the 2002 Annual Report.

In particular, the Commission wishes to thank Renee McPhatter, from Councilmember Kathy Patterson's office, and Judi Garrett, Esq., from the Federal Bureau of Prisons, for their contributions to the Commission's on-going activities and their diligent work with subcommittees leading up to this Annual Report.

Regarding data collection and analysis, we wish to thank the following individuals for their assistance and insight:

Dan Cipullo, Anne Wickes, Joanne Pozzo, Don Overholzer, Frank Nowicki, Debbie Grafton, and Jason Tang from Superior Court.

Janice Bergen and Ron Hickey from the Pretrial Services Agency.

Avi Bhati from the Urban Institute.



District of Columbia Advisory Commission on Sentencing

800 K Street, NW, Suite 450 South, Washington, D.C. 20001 (202) 353-7797 – Fax (202) 353-7831

Hon. Frederick H. Weisberg, Chairman

Executive Director

Kim S. Hunt, Ph.D.

Hon. Harold L. Cushenberry Laura E. Hankins, Esq. Cedric Hendricks, Esq. Hon. Ramsey Johnson Hon. Kathleen Patterson Patricia Riley, Esq. Michele Roberts, Esq. Audrey Rowe Earl J. Silbert, Esq. Julie Stewart Sharon Styles-Anderson, Esq. Charles F. Wellford, Ph.D.

November 27, 2002

Non-voting members: Brenda Baldwin-White, Esq. Peter Hoffman, Ph.D. Nola Joyce Thomas R. Kane, Ph.D. The Honorable Linda W. Cropp, Chairman Council of the District of Columbia 1350 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW Washington, D.C. 20004

Enclosed please find the report entitled 2002 Annual Report of the District of Columbia Advisory Commission on Sentencing, submitted pursuant to Section 6 of the Advisory Commission on Sentencing Establishment Act of 1998, as amended by the Sentencing Reform Amendment Act of 2000 (D.C. Official Code § 3-105 (2001)).

Respectfully submitted,

Frederick H. Weisberg, Chairman

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION AND EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	i
Chapter I.	
SURVEY OF SENTENCING SYSTEMS IN USE IN THE UNITED STATES	1
Defining the Terms and Understanding Structured Sentencing	1
Setting the Framework: The Commission's Methodology for Analyzing State System	s8
Results of the Evaluation of Structured Sentencing Systems	17
Commission's Deliberations and Recommendations	24
Chapter II.	
CRIMINAL SENTENCING PRACTICE, JANUARY 1996 TO JUNE 2002	29
Collecting Data on Sentences	30
Felony Sentences, January 1996 through June 2002	36
Offender Background Characteristics	47
Summary	52
Chapter III.	
ASSESSMENT OF INDETERMINATE SENTENCING PRATICES IN	THE
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, 1996-2001	53
Recapitulation of Sentencing Laws 1996 to 2001	54
Assessment of Old Law Sentencing Practices, January 1996 through December 2001	
Understanding Sentencing Outcomes	63
Analysis of the Decision to Incarcerate (Old Law Only)	66
Analysis of the Sentence Length (Old Law Only)	
Conclusion	81
Chapter IV.	
ASSESSMENT OF DETERMINATE SENTENCING PRACTICES IN	THE
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA THROUGH JUNE 30, 2002	83
Overview of Determinate Sentences	05
Assessment of New Law Sentencing Practices, August 5, 2000 to June 30, 2002	84
Assessment of New Law Sentencing Practices, August 5, 2000 to June 30, 2002 Statistical Analysis of The Decision To Incarcerate	84 90
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	84 90 90
Statistical Analysis of The Decision To Incarcerate	84 90 90
Statistical Analysis of The Decision To Incarcerate	84 90 90
Statistical Analysis of The Decision To Incarcerate Statistical Analysis of Length Of Sentence Interim Assessment of The Implementation of Determinate Sentencing In Superior	84 90 90 94
Statistical Analysis of The Decision To Incarcerate Statistical Analysis of Length Of Sentence Interim Assessment of The Implementation of Determinate Sentencing In Superior Court	84 90 90 94
Statistical Analysis of The Decision To Incarcerate Statistical Analysis of Length Of Sentence Interim Assessment of The Implementation of Determinate Sentencing In Superior Court Conclusion	90 90 94 98
Statistical Analysis of The Decision To Incarcerate Statistical Analysis of Length Of Sentence Interim Assessment of The Implementation of Determinate Sentencing In Superior Court Conclusion Chapter V.	84 90 90 94 98 107
Statistical Analysis of The Decision To Incarcerate Statistical Analysis of Length Of Sentence Interim Assessment of The Implementation of Determinate Sentencing In Superior Court Conclusion Chapter V. CLASSIFICATION OR RANKING OF FELONY OFFENSES IN THE DISTR OF COLUMBIA Background	84 90 94 98 107 RICT 109
Statistical Analysis of The Decision To Incarcerate Statistical Analysis of Length Of Sentence Interim Assessment of The Implementation of Determinate Sentencing In Superior Court Conclusion Chapter V. CLASSIFICATION OR RANKING OF FELONY OFFENSES IN THE DISTROF COLUMBIA Background Methodology: Criteria Developed for Rankings	84 90 94 98 107 RICT 109
Statistical Analysis of The Decision To Incarcerate Statistical Analysis of Length Of Sentence Interim Assessment of The Implementation of Determinate Sentencing In Superior Court Conclusion Chapter V. CLASSIFICATION OR RANKING OF FELONY OFFENSES IN THE DISTR OF COLUMBIA Background	84 90 94 98 107 RICT 109
Statistical Analysis of The Decision To Incarcerate Statistical Analysis of Length Of Sentence Interim Assessment of The Implementation of Determinate Sentencing In Superior Court Conclusion Chapter V. CLASSIFICATION OR RANKING OF FELONY OFFENSES IN THE DISTR OF COLUMBIA Background Methodology: Criteria Developed for Rankings General Procedures of Offense Ranking Rankings	84 90 94 98 107 RICT 109 111 113
Statistical Analysis of The Decision To Incarcerate Statistical Analysis of Length Of Sentence Interim Assessment of The Implementation of Determinate Sentencing In Superior Court Conclusion Chapter V. CLASSIFICATION OR RANKING OF FELONY OFFENSES IN THE DISTR OF COLUMBIA Background Methodology: Criteria Developed for Rankings General Procedures of Offense Ranking Rankings Conclusion	84 90 94 98 107 RICT 109 111 113
Statistical Analysis of The Decision To Incarcerate Statistical Analysis of Length Of Sentence Interim Assessment of The Implementation of Determinate Sentencing In Superior Court Conclusion Chapter V. CLASSIFICATION OR RANKING OF FELONY OFFENSES IN THE DISTI OF COLUMBIA Background Methodology: Criteria Developed for Rankings General Procedures of Offense Ranking Rankings Conclusion Appendices	84 90 94 98 107 RICT 109 111 113
Statistical Analysis of The Decision To Incarcerate Statistical Analysis of Length Of Sentence Interim Assessment of The Implementation of Determinate Sentencing In Superior Court Conclusion Chapter V. CLASSIFICATION OR RANKING OF FELONY OFFENSES IN THE DISTH OF COLUMBIA Background Methodology: Criteria Developed for Rankings General Procedures of Offense Ranking Rankings Conclusion Appendices APPENDIX A: Chapter I Appendices	84 90 94 98 107 RICT 109 111 113
Statistical Analysis of The Decision To Incarcerate Statistical Analysis of Length Of Sentence Interim Assessment of The Implementation of Determinate Sentencing In Superior Court Conclusion Chapter V. CLASSIFICATION OR RANKING OF FELONY OFFENSES IN THE DISTI OF COLUMBIA Background Methodology: Criteria Developed for Rankings General Procedures of Offense Ranking Rankings Conclusion Appendices	84 90 94 98 107 RICT 109 111 113 114 129 dix-1

APPENDIX D: Chapter IV	Appendix-19
APPENDIX E: Chapter V	Appendix-23

LIST OF TABLES AND FIGURES	Figure 2-10 . Distribution by Race for Sentenced Felony Offenders, January	
FIGURES	1996 to June 200249	
CHAPTER II	TABLES	
Figure 2-1. Trends in Sentences Imposed on All Felony Offenders	CHAPTER II	
Sentenced During January 1996 to June 2002, by Type of Sentenced Imposed	Table 2-1. Number and Type of Sentences Imposed on Felony Defendants Sentenced For All Cases Sentenced between January 1996 to June	
Figure 2-2. Disposition Types for All Drug Offenses, by Year (January 1996	2002, by Major Offense Category36	
to June 2002)41	Table 2-2. Percent of Type of Sentences Imposed on Felony Defendants	
Figure 2-3. Disposition types for Level One Violent Offenses, by Year	Sentenced For All Cases Sentenced between January 1996 to June 2002, by	
(January 1996 to June 2002)42	Major Offense Category36	
Figure 2-4. Disposition Types for Level Two Violent Offenses, by Year (January 1996 to June 2002)43	Table 2-3. Trends in Sentences Imposed on All Felony Defendants Sentenced During January 1996 to June 2002, by Type of Sentence Imposed	
Figure 2-5. Disposition Types for Seriousness Level Three Violent	(Number)38	
Offenses, by Year44	Table 2-4. Trends in Sentences Imposed on All Felony Defendants Sentenced	
Figure 2-6. Disposition Types of All Property Offenses, by Year (January 1996 to June 2002)45	During January 1996 to June 2002, by Type of Sentence Imposed (Percent)38	
Figure 2-7. Disposition Types for All	Table 2-5. Trends in Sentences Imposed	
Weapons Offenses, by Year (January 1996 to June 2002)46	on Felony Defendants During January 1996 to June 2002, by Major Offense	
Figure 2-8. Disposition Types for All	Category40	
Public Order Offenses, by Year (January 1996 to June 2002)46	Table 2-6. Age of Felony Offenders Sentenced, January 1996 to June 2002	
Figure 2-9. Age Distribution of Felony Offenders Sentenced, January 1996 to June 2002, By Age Category48		

Table 2-7. Age of Felony OffendersSentenced, January 1996 to June 2002,by Gender	Table 3-4. Minimum Felony Sentence inMonths for Old Law Property Offenses,by Year
Table 2-8. Age of Felony Offenders Sentenced, January 1996 to June 2002, by Race	Table 3-5. Minimum Felony Sentence in Months for Old Law Drug Offenses, by Year
Table 2-9. Number of Prior Felony Convictions for Felony Offenders Sentenced, January 1996 to June 2002, by Major Offense Category	Table 3-6. Minimum Felony Sentence in Months for Old Law Weapon Offenses, by Year
Year50	Table 3-7. Minimum Felony Sentence in Months for Old Law Public Order
Table 2-10. Number of Prior Felony Commitments for Felony Offenders	Offenses, by Year62
Sentenced, January 1996 to June 2002, by Major Offense Category Year51	Table 3-8. Incarceration Rate by Offense Category and Prior Felony Convictions for Old Law Cases, 1996-2001
CHAPTER III	Table 3-9. Incarceration Rate by
Table 3-1. Trends in Sentences Imposed on Felony Defendants Sentenced Under Old Law, by Type of Sentence Imposed (Number)56	Offense Category and Number of Charges for Old Law Cases, 1996-2001
Table 3-2. Trends in Sentences Imposed on Felony Defendants Sentenced Under Old Law, by Type of Sentence Imposed	Offense Category, Prior Felony Convictions, and Number of Charges for Old Law Cases, 1996-200170
(Percent)56	Table 3-11. Incarceration Rate by Offense Category, Prior Felony
Table 3-3a. Minimum Felony Sentence in Months for Old Law Violent Level 1 Offenses, by Year58	Convictions, and Race of Offender for Old Law Cases, 1996-200171
•	Table 3-12. Incarceration Rate by
Table 3-3b. Minimum Felony Sentencein Months for Old Law Violent Level 2Offenses, by Year58	Offense Category, Prior Felony Convictions, and Gender of Offender for Old Law Cases, 1996-200172
Table 3-3c. Minimum Felony Sentence in Months for Old Law Violent Level 3 Offenses, by Year59	Table 3-13. Incarceration Rate by Offense Category, Prior Felony Convictions, and Age of Offender for Old Law Cases, 1996-200173

Table 3-14. Incarceration Rate by	CHAPTER IV		
Offense Category, Prior Felony			
Convictions, and Unarmed/Armed	Table 4-1. Sentences Imposed on Felony		
Offense Convictions for Old Law Cases,	Defendants Sentenced Under New Law		
1996-200174	by Year, by Type of Sentence Imposed		
	(Number)85		
Table 3-15. Median Old Law Sentence			
Length in Months by Offense Category	Table 4-2. Sentences Imposed on Felony		
and Number of Charges, 1996-	Defendants Sentenced Under New Law		
200175	by Year, by Type of Sentence Imposed (Percent)86		
Table 3-16. Median Old Law Sentence			
Length in Months by Offense Category	Table 4-3. Sentences Imposed on Felony		
and Prior Felony Convictions, 1996-	Defendants Sentenced Under New Law,		
200176	in 2001 and first half of 2002 by Major		
	Offense Category87		
Table 3-17. Median Old Law Sentence			
Length in Months by Offense Category,	Table 4-4. Felony Sentence in Months		
Number of Charges, and Prior Felony	for New Law Violent Offenses, by		
Convictions, 1996- 200177	Year88		
Table 3-18. Median Old Law Sentence	Table 4-5. Felony Sentence in Months		
Length in Months by Offense Category,	for New Law Drug Offenses, by Year		
Number of Charges, and Race, 1996-	89		
200178			
	Table 4-6. Incarceration Rate by		
Table 3-19. Median Old Law Sentence	Offense Category and Prior Felony		
Length in Months by Offense Category,	Convictions for New Law Cases, August		
Number of Charges, and Gender, 1996-	2000- June 200291		
200179			
	Table 4-7. Incarceration Rate by		
Table 3-20. Median Old Law Sentence	Offense Category and Number of		
Length in Months by Offense Category,	Charges for New Law Cases, August		
Number of Charges, and Age Category,	2000- June 200292		
1996- 200180			
	Table 4-8. Incarceration Rate for New		
Table 3-21. Median Old Law Sentence	Law Drug Cases by Prior Felony		
Length in Months by Offense Category,	Convictions and Number of Charges,		
Number of Charges, and Armed, 1996-	August 2000- June 200293		
200181	m.v. 40 *		
	Table 4-9. Incarceration Rate for New		
	Law Drug Cases by Prior Felony		
	Convictions and Gender of Offender,		
	August 2000- June 200293		

Table 4-10. Incarceration Rate for New Law Drug Cases by Prior Felony Convictions, and Age of Offender, August 2000- June 200294
Table 4-11 . Median Sentence Length in Months for New Law Cases by Offense Category and Number of Charges, August 2000- June 200294
Table 4-12. Median Sentence Length in Months for New Law Cases by Offense Category and Prior Felony Convictions, August 2000- June 200296
Table 4-13. Median Sentence Length in Months for New Law Drug Offense by Number of Charges and Prior Felony Convictions, August 2000- June 2002
Table 4-14. Median Sentence Length in Months for New Law Drug Offense by Number of Charges and Age Category, August 2000-June 200298